UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,606	08/31/2001	Tetsuya Uemura	520.40551X00	7478

24956	7590	06/15/2006		

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
SHERKAT, AREZOO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/942,606	UEMURA, TETSUYA
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arezoo Sherkat	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *5-11,13-15 and 17-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *5-11,13-15 and 17-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 August 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to amendment received on 3/16/2006. Claims 5,

7, 8, and 19-24 are amended. Claims 5-11, 13-15, and 17-24 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of claims 19-24 is withdrawn in view of the newly

discovered reference(s) to Horvitz, (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,133) and Li et al., (U.S.

Publication No. 2004/0210604). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s)

follow.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show

every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "a plurality of

clients" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter

should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in

reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended

replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure

number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure

is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,

and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate

changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an

application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next

Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 5-7, 10-11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Datta, (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,168).

Regarding claims 5 and 7, Datta discloses a cache server set between a content

server and a plurality of clients for distributing contents to the clients, based on requests

sent from the clients, said content server is requested to provide contents by said clients

via said cache server and in response transfers said requested contents to the clients

(col. 15, lines 10-65), said cache server comprising:

an apparatus for collecting contents access situation information from the clients,

and an apparatus for analyzing contents access trends based on the contents access

situation information of accesses to the contents as conducted by the clients (col. 11,

lines 50-67 and col. 12, lines 1-8);

an apparatus for transmitting the contents access trends to an apparatus which

predicts contents expected to be in demand for said clients in the future based on the

contents access trends and causing the contents expected to be in demand in the future

to be transmitted (col. 14, lines 25-67 and col. 15, lines 1-10); and

an apparatus for receiving the contents expected to be in demand in the future

from the content server in advance before access requests are received from the

clients, and a cache apparatus for storing the received contents (col. 14, lines 50-67

and col. 15, lines 1-10); and

an apparatus for transmitting the requested contents form the contents expected

to be in demand in the future to the clients in accordance with the requests when

received from the clients (col. 15, lines 10-65).

Regarding claims 6 and 15, Datta discloses an apparatus for distributing contents

to a client, comprising:

an apparatus for transmitting the contents access situation information to the

server, which transmits a list of the contents predicted, an apparatus for receiving the

list of the contents from the server, and an apparatus for acquiring the contents based

on the list of the contents (col. 12, lines 9-63).

Regarding claim 10, Datta discloses wherein both a first contents distribution

apparatus and a second contents distribution apparatus are the contents distribution

apparatus, wherein:

The first contents distribution apparatus transmits first contents acquired from a

neighboring server to the second contents distribution apparatus, and the second

contents distribution apparatus transmits second contents acquired from a neighboring

server to the first contents distribution apparatus (col. 14, lines 50-67 and col. 15, lines

1-10).

Regarding claim 11, Datta discloses an apparatus for determining a deletion

timing of the contents acquired using the contents access situation information (col. 17,

lines 40-67 and col. 18, lines 1-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-9, 14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Datta, (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,168), in view of Alegre et al., (U.S.

Patent No. 6,199,113 and Alegre hereinafter).

Regarding claims 8, 14, and 18, Datta discloses a cache server set between a

content server and a plurality of clients for distributing contents to the clients, based on

requests sent from the clients, said content server is requested to provide contents by

said clients via said cache server and in response transfers said requested contents to

the clients (col. 15, lines 10-65), said cache server comprising:

an apparatus for collecting contents access situation information from the clients,

and an apparatus for analyzing contents access trends based on the contents access

situation information of accesses to the contents as conducted by the clients (col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 12, lines 1-8);

an apparatus for transmitting the contents access trends to an apparatus which predicts contents expected to be in demand for said clients in the future based on the contents access trends and causing the contents expected to be in demand in the future to be transmitted (col. 14, lines 25-67 and col. 15, lines 1-10); and

an apparatus for receiving the contents expected to be in demand in the future from the content server in advance before access requests are received from the clients, and a cache apparatus for storing the received content (col. 14, lines 50-67 and col. 15, lines 1-10); and

an apparatus for transmitting the requested contents form the contents expected to be in demand in the future to the clients in accordance with the requests when received from the clients (col. 15, lines 10-65).

Datta does not expressly disclose an apparatus for storing a database for recording information for distinguishing a client and recording permission information concerning distribution of contents to the client, an authentication apparatus for authenticating the client and acquiring the information for distinguishing the client.

However, Alegre discloses a database for recording information for distinguishing a client and recording permission information concerning distribution of contents to the client (i.e., authentication database)(col. 6, lines 23-42);

a database access apparatus (i.e., authentication server), an authentication

apparatus for authenticating the client and acquiring the information for distinguishing

the client (col. 4, lines 8-67);

an apparatus for receiving the permission information concerning distribution of

contents to the client from a server which manages distribution permission information,

an apparatus for requesting acquisition of permission to distribute the contents from the

server to the client (col. 7, lines 44-67 and col. 8, lines 1-45); and

an apparatus for transmitting the contents to the client in accordance with the

request when received from the client, wherein: the client distinguishing information is

acquired by the authentication apparatus when contents distribution request is received

from the client (col. 4, lines 8-67).

Moreover, Alegre discloses wherein the distribution permission information of the

contents (i.e., user access profile) is checked for the client distinguishing information by

the database access apparatus (col.5, lines 20-47), the contents are distributed to the

client when the distribution is permitted (col.7, lines 1-18),

a request is made to acquire permission to distribute the contents from the server

to the client by the apparatus for requesting acquisition of permission when the

distribution is not permitted (col.5, lines 59-67 and Col.6, lines 1-5 and col. 8, lines 20-

45), and

the permission information concerning distribution of contents to the client is

written by the database access apparatus onto the database for recording permission

information, and the contents are distributed to the client when the apparatus for

receiving the permission information (i.e., user access profile) receives permission to

distribute the contents to the client from the server (col. 4, lines 24-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Datta by including permission

information concerning distribution of contents to the clients as disclosed by Alegre.

This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated by the suggestion of Alegre to provide a higher level of

security for trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a

controlled and secured manner (Alegre, Col. 2, lines 24-35).

Regarding claim 9, Datta does not expressly disclose permission information

concerning distribution of contents to the clients and an encryption key to encrypt and/or

decrypt the content for distribution.

However, Alegre discloses when distribution of the contents to the client is not

permitted, the apparatus for receiving the permission information receives the

distribution permission, and the database access apparatus writes the permission

information onto the permission information concerning the distribution of the contents

in the database (col. 4, lines 24-67).

wherein: the contents are encrypted and an entry which registers the decryption

key of the contents exists in the database, and the server manages the decryption key,

the apparatus further comprises: an apparatus for requesting the decryption key from

the server, an apparatus for receiving the decryption key from the server which

manages the decryption key (col. 4, lines 8-67 and col. 5, lines 1-20); and

an apparatus for distributing the decryption key to the client, wherein: when

distribution of the contents to the client is permitted and the decryption key is registered

in the database, the decryption key is distributed to the client by the apparatus for

distributing the decryption key (col. 6, lines 23-50),

when distribution of the contents to the client is permitted and the decryption key

is not registered in the database, the decryption key is requested from the server by the

apparatus for requesting the decryption key, received by the apparatus for receiving the

decryption key, registered in the database by the database access apparatus, and

distributed to the client by the apparatus for distributing the decryption key (col. 6, lines

50-67), and

the decryption key is requested from the server by the apparatus for requesting

the decryption key, received from the server by the apparatus for receiving the

decryption key, and distributed to the client by the apparatus for distributing the

decryption key (col. 6, lines 23-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Datta by including permission

information concerning distribution of contents to the clients and an encryption key to

encrypt and/or decrypt the content for distribution as disclosed by Alegre. This

modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated by the suggestion of Alegre to provide a higher level of security

for trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and

secured manner (Alegre, Col. 2, lines 24-35) and to prevent an intruder from

monitoring communications (Alegre, Col. 1, lines 13-55).

Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Datta, (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,168), in view of Scott et al., (U.S. Patent No.

6,338,094 and Scott hereinafter).

Teachings of Datta with respect to claims 5 and 7 have been discussed

previously.

Regarding claims 13 and 17, Datta discloses providing a preloader that works in

conjunction with a web/app server and optionally a profile server to cache web page

content elements or components for faster on-demand and anticipatory dynamic web

page delivery (col. 3, lines 5-25).

Moreover, Scott discloses receiving the contents from the server in a time zone

when there is sufficient network bandwidth (col. 2, lines 22-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Datta by including receiving the

contents from the server in a time zone when there is sufficient network bandwidth as

disclosed by Scott. This modification would have been obvious because one of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Scott to

provide a better usage of bandwidth during an otherwise idle time (Scott, Abstract).

Claims 19, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Datta, (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,168), in view of Alegre et al., (U.S.

Patent No. 6,199,113 and Alegre hereinafter), in further view of Horvitz, (U.S. Patent

No. 6,182,133).

Regarding claims 19, 21, and 23, Datta discloses an apparatus set between a

server and a client for distributing contents to the client, comprising:

an apparatus for collecting contents access situation information from the client,

and an apparatus for analyzing contents access trends based on the contents access

situation information (col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 12, lines 1-8);

an apparatus for transmitting the contents access trends to a server which

predicts contents expected to be in demand for said clients in the future based on the

contents access trends and transmits the contents (col. 14, lines 25-67 and col. 15,

lines 1-10); and

an apparatus for receiving the contents expected to be in demand in the future

from the server in advance before access request is received from the client, and an

apparatus for storing the received contents (col. 14, lines 50-67 and col. 15, lines 1-10);

and

an apparatus for transmitting the requested contents form the contents expected

to be in demand in the future to the clients in accordance with the requests when

received from the clients (col. 15, lines 10-65).

Datta does not expressly disclose an apparatus for storing a database for

recording information for distinguishing a client and recording permission information

concerning distribution of contents to the client, an authentication apparatus for

authenticating the client and acquiring the information for distinguishing the client.

However, Alegre discloses a database for recording information for distinguishing

a client and recording permission information concerning distribution of contents to the

client (i.e., authentication database)(col. 6, lines 23-42);

a database access apparatus (i.e., authentication server), an authentication

apparatus for authenticating the client and acquiring the information for distinguishing

the client (col. 4, lines 8-67);

an apparatus for receiving the permission information concerning distribution of

contents to the client from a server which manages distribution permission information,

an apparatus for requesting acquisition of permission to distribute the contents from the

server to the client (col. 7, lines 44-67 and col. 8, lines 1-45); and

an apparatus for transmitting the contents to the client in accordance with the

request when received from the client, wherein: the client distinguishing information is

acquired by the authentication apparatus when contents distribution request is received

from the client (col. 4, lines 8-67).

Moreover, Alegre discloses wherein the distribution permission information of the

contents (i.e., user access profile) is checked for the client distinguishing information by

the database access apparatus (col.5, lines 20-47), the contents are distributed to the

client when the distribution is permitted (col.7, lines 1-18),

a request is made to acquire permission to distribute the contents from the server

to the client by the apparatus for requesting acquisition of permission when the

distribution is not permitted (col.5, lines 59-67 and Col.6, lines 1-5 and col. 8, lines 20-

45), and

the permission information concerning distribution of contents to the client is

written by the database access apparatus onto the database for recording permission

information, and the contents are distributed to the client when the apparatus for

receiving the permission information (i.e., user access profile) receives permission to

distribute the contents to the client from the server (col. 4, lines 24-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Datta by including permission

information concerning distribution of contents to the clients as disclosed by Alegre.

This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated by the suggestion of Alegre to provide a higher level of

security for trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a

controlled and secured manner (Alegre, Col. 2, lines 24-35).

Datta discloses a profile server generating a hint, which is a set of action-node-

probability tuples, which represent actions that the user is likely to take on a particular

node, together with the corresponding probability that the user will choose the action-

node, given his current clickstream (col. 10, lines 40-67 and col. 11, lines 1-50).

Moreover, Horvitz, in block 1715, assigns, for each URL in the set and through

the user model, an appropriate estimate of the likelihood (probability, p) that the user

will next transition to this URL. Thereafter, execution proceeds to block 1720, which, for each URL in the set, calculates a corresponding flux-product value as being a product of the rate of refinement in value and the corresponding transition probability. Once this occurs, execution proceeds to block 1725 which, when executed, sorts the URL in the set, in terms of their flux-product values, to yield a list of URLs, and associated flux-product values, ordered in descending flux-product order (Note: Also see figures 11A-11B and 13A-13B and their related text)(col. 33, lines 27-67 and 34, lines 1-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the combined teachings of Datta and Alegre by including calculating a corresponding flux-product value as being a product of the rate of refinement in value and the corresponding transition probability and acquiring the contents from the server in decreasing order of the acquisition weight as disclosed by Horvitz. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Horvitz to significantly increase the rate at which pages are typically displayed to a user, thus reducing user frustration and increasing user satisfaction (Horvitz, col. 3, lines 25-40).

Claims 20, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Datta, (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,168), in view of Alegre et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,113 and Alegre hereinafter), in further view of Li et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0210604 and Li hereinafter).

Regarding claims 20, 22, and 24, Datta discloses an apparatus set between a server and a client for distributing contents to the client, comprising:

an apparatus for collecting contents access situation information from the client, and an apparatus for analyzing contents access trends based on the contents access situation information (col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 12, lines 1-8);

an apparatus for transmitting the contents access trends to a server which predicts contents expected to be in demand for said clients in the future based on the contents access trends and transmits the contents (col. 14, lines 25-67 and col. 15, lines 1-10); and

an apparatus for receiving the contents expected to be in demand in the future from the server in advance before access request is received from the client, and an apparatus for storing the received contents (col. 14, lines 50-67 and col. 15, lines 1-10); and

an apparatus for transmitting the requested contents form the contents expected to be in demand in the future to the clients in accordance with the requests when received from the clients (col. 15, lines 10-65).

Datta does not expressly disclose an apparatus for storing a database for recording information for distinguishing a client and recording permission information concerning distribution of contents to the client, an authentication apparatus for authenticating the client and acquiring the information for distinguishing the client.

However, Alegre discloses a database for recording information for distinguishing

a client and recording permission information concerning distribution of contents to the

client (i.e., authentication database)(col. 6, lines 23-42);

a database access apparatus (i.e., authentication server), an authentication

apparatus for authenticating the client and acquiring the information for distinguishing

the client (col. 4, lines 8-67);

an apparatus for receiving the permission information concerning distribution of

contents to the client from a server which manages distribution permission information,

an apparatus for requesting acquisition of permission to distribute the contents from the

server to the client (col. 7, lines 44-67 and col. 8, lines 1-45); and

an apparatus for transmitting the contents to the client in accordance with the

request when received from the client, wherein: the client distinguishing information is

acquired by the authentication apparatus when contents distribution request is received

from the client (col. 4, lines 8-67).

Moreover, Alegre discloses wherein the distribution permission information of the

contents (i.e., user access profile) is checked for the client distinguishing information by

the database access apparatus (col.5, lines 20-47), the contents are distributed to the

client when the distribution is permitted (col.7, lines 1-18),

a request is made to acquire permission to distribute the contents from the server

to the client by the apparatus for requesting acquisition of permission when the

distribution is not permitted (col.5, lines 59-67 and Col.6, lines 1-5 and col. 8, lines 20-

45), and

the permission information concerning distribution of contents to the client is

written by the database access apparatus onto the database for recording permission

information, and the contents are distributed to the client when the apparatus for

receiving the permission information (i.e., user access profile) receives permission to

distribute the contents to the client from the server (col. 4, lines 24-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Datta by including permission

information concerning distribution of contents to the clients as disclosed by Alegre.

This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated by the suggestion of Alegre to provide a higher level of

security for trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a

controlled and secured manner (Alegre, Col. 2, lines 24-35).

Datta discloses an apparatus for determining a deletion timing of the contents

acquired using the contents access situation information (col. 17, lines 40-67 and col.

18, lines 1-18).

Moreover, Li discloses calculating a hit count tag that gives an indication of how

many times a particular portion has been accessed, and an importance tag that gives a

weight to the hit count and determines how long the portion can stay in cache (page 5,

par. 0056).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the combined teachings of Datta and Alegre

by including wherein calculating a hit count tag that gives an indication of how many

times a particular portion has been accessed, and an importance tag that gives a

weight to the hit count and determines how long the portion can stay in cache as

disclosed by Li. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Li o determine whether

or not to remove individual portions of the structured media content file from a client

cache file to make room for other more important file portions (Li, page 2, par. 0016).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Dragulev et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037407), and

LeMole et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.S.

Patent Examiner
Group 2131
June 10, 2006

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100